



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/772,313

02/06/2004

Y.S. Fung

2587/79618/RDK

7424

23432 7590 03/09/2010

COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP
30 Rockefeller Plaza
20th Floor
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

MAYEKAR, KISHOR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/09/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/772,313	Applicant(s) FUNG ET AL.	
	Examiner Kishor Mayekar	Art Unit 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment of 19 November 2009 has been entered. Claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-17 are pending in this application with claim 1 being sole independent claim.

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the unit of conductivity is incorrect from the entering of amendment. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Art Unit: 1795

5. Claims 1 and 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over December (6,214,188 B1) in light of December (US 6,342,144 B1). December '188's invention, a reference cited in the last Office action, is directed to an anodic electrodeposition method. December discloses, in the abstract and col. 6, lines 48-55, that the method comprises the steps of immersing a conductive workpiece in an electrophoretic bath

- o comprising, in an aqueous medium, base-salted water dispersible polymer with particle size between 0.05 to 5 microns (or 50 to 5000 nm) , preferably less than 2.0 microns, see col. 6, l. 48-55 and paragraph crossing c. 6 and 7 and

Examples 2 and 4 ;

- o having an electroconductivity between 0.1 to 5 mS/cm (or 100 to 5000 μ S/cm), see col. 8, lines 9-16; and
- o containing a coalescing solvent in an amount between 0 and 15 wt%, preferably from 0.5 to 2.0 wt%, see col. 7, lines 32-46.

December also discloses in Example 5 the coating method and in Example 2 with the emulsion having a particle size of 0.22 microns (or 220 nm). The difference between December and independent claim 1 is the recited limitation of the particles "having a particle size between 10 and 100 nm with an average particle size of about 50 nm". However, since December discloses that his emulsion having **the average particle size diameter of about 50 to 2000 nm**, that is including the average particle size of about

Art Unit: 1795

50 to 100 nm, it appears that December's method is able to electrodeposit particles of the recited limitation when the bath comprises particles having the average particle size of 50 to 100 nm, and further, in view of particle size of 220 nm in Example 2, the selection of the particle size, namely 50 nm, within the recited limitation for the anodic electrodeposition method would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art. December '144 teaches that **the polymer of December '188 is an acrylic polymer** (c. 5, l. 48 through c. 6, l. 38).

As to the subject matter of claims 4 and 5, December discloses that the bath may contain pigments. As such the provision of the bath with or without pigment would have been obvious by the teachings of December.

As to the subject matter of claim 6 or 12, December discloses that the bath has a solids content of 19% (Examples 2 and 4).

As to the subject matter of each of claims 7-11 and 13-17, December further discloses the effecting of the coating and the curing of the formed coating (col. 8, lines 16-27 and Example 5 with an error indicated on the bath temperature as asserted by the examiner in the final Office action of 14 April 2009). The difference between December and claims 7 and 13 is the recited driving voltage. The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified December's teachings because it has been settled that proper

Art Unit: 1795

adjustment of a known effective variable of a known or obvious process is within the capabilities of one having ordinary skill in the art. *In re Aller* 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 19 November 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the new ground of rejection as set forth in paragraph above.

As to the argument in paragraph crossing pages 6 and 7, the examiner finds this is unpersuasive because December'188's carbamate-containing polymer is an acrylic polymer, the voltage selection as asserted by the examiner in the last Office action, the acrylic polymer comprises acidic group and is base salted for use in the anodic electrodeposition method which is similar to that disclosed in page 6 of the present invention, and the bath comprises a coalescing solvent in an amount between 0 and 15 wt%, preferably from 0.5 to 2.0 wt%, as asserted by the examiner in the last Office action.

Conclusion

7. Claims 1 and 3-17 are rejected.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 1795

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

Art Unit: 1795

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kishor Mayekar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795